

**FILED**

**MAY 22 2006**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

RAJENDER SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 04-75264

Agency No. A78-642-428

MEMORANDUM<sup>\*</sup>

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted May 15, 2006<sup>\*\*</sup>

Before: B. FLETCHER, TROTT, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

Rajender Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of a summary order of the Board of Immigration Appeals upholding an Immigration Judge's ("IJ") denial of his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and

---

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”).

We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. Reviewing for substantial evidence, *Ali v. Ashcroft*, 394 F.3d 780, 784 (9th Cir. 2005), we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s finding that Singh does not have a well-founded fear of future persecution because Singh testified that he lived elsewhere in India without incident. *Cf. Melkonian v. Ashcroft*, 320 F.3d 1061, 1069 (9th Cir. 2003) (stating that asylum may be denied to an applicant who has otherwise demonstrated a well-founded fear of future persecution if the evidence shows that internal relocation is a reasonable option); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 208.13(b)(2)(ii).

Because Singh failed to establish that he was eligible for asylum, he necessarily failed to establish eligibility for withholding of removal. *See Cruz-Navarro v. INS*, 232 F.3d 1024, 1031 (9th Cir. 2000).

Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s denial of Singh’s CAT claim because Singh was able to relocate within India. *See Singh v. Ashcroft*, 351 F.3d 435, 443 (9th Cir. 2003).

To the extent that Singh challenges the sufficiency of the BIA’s streamlining procedures, we reject this contention. *See Falcon Carriche v.*

*Ashcroft*, 350 F.3d 845, 851 (9th Cir. 2003).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**